

Legend

Legend HW 3/23/78

I have read but a few pages. I'll not be reading much more if any tonight. I may get to read more in the a.m., until Hil is up, when I expect to return to the DJ annotations. Before bed there are a few observations and impressions I want to note.

I think that this book has better prospects for helping us in FOIA than I'd thought before beginning to read it. And in the first two dozen pages he discloses having received from Archives and FBI as well as CIA what I'd asked for and not gotten. Farthur into it I'm sure there will be more more of this.

As far as I've gone he is all conjecture, using fact that is not in real point on the conjecture to make it appear reasonable.

He lies, as in claiming he got the 1/27 transcript under FOIA. (And then uses it only relating to Marina's questioning.) He claims to have gotten under FOIA what was available before the time he says he began this book.

This is very dirty writing aside from being the writing of a liar. He says what is not true by inference and by over-writing. Only a subject expert can detect these things.

He is incredibly inconsiderate of his sources. As in disclosing that in 1965 Liebelier put him on to Nosenko in what is described as a serious breach of security and I say should have led to punishment of Liebelier. Instead he got a lawyer's post in the Nixon administration. (I've long know that Liebelier stole enormous quantities of records.)

I think he should be read with great care because I think it is possible he may disclose what he did not intend to disclose, having begun with a preconception if not a special assignment. The detail he adds to what I had not known in full (or forgot if I knew) can be indicative of CIA hysteria. As in their drafts of what was to be asked of the USSR. Epsteins treats it as right and proper.

Dave asked me to tape notes but I think these notes will be so extensive they'll have to be typed. They will include much more than he'd want and much more than we can use in the FOIA matters but it is not impossible that there may be other uses for them. I'll see if later Hil will be able to transcribe them. For now, pending discussion of the possibilities of our needs, I'll do as I had to do when I began to read this in the medical lab today, & I'll mark the book up.

I'm disappointed that there is no indication of this in Sylvia's notes. I can't be sure about Hoch's because he has not gotten to his specifics but I am inclined to think he will not see some of these things because they would have been appropriate to the memo he did do.

The extraordinary size of the staff on this project-no mention of Barron regardless of what Policoff said- leaves no excuse for the kind of "error" that exists. It also is a spectacular cash investment. The financial risk in this is fantastic. It could not have been risked without some assurance of what was delivered to Epstein (alone) unless there was a purpose to be served by a financial loss, like a spook purpose.

I find myself wondering about how much Jones Harris had to do with the beginning of this - and why- for whom - in what if any capacity.

Epsteinker is shameless. It is sinister for LEO to walk into the Russian Embassy and see Kostikov, who doubled as KGB (suspected only, I gather) but it is not sinister for LEO to walk into the US Embassy in Moscow and of all people be seen by Richard Snyder, who doubled as CIA. For real, not conjecture. (And we are supposed to believe that LEO would have written his kinds of letters to the USSR Emb in his clandestine role. They and he never heard that their mail was intercepted?) There are other places where we and the Russians do the same thing only it is suspicious only when they do it.